Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 14, 19 and 21-23 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 5, 10-13, 15-18 and 20 are cancelled.

Claims 1-3 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Takemura et al. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection.

With regard to claim 1, Takemura et al. does not disclose or suggest,

> ...the first and second address pit sequences each having a respective center axis extending along the information reading direction disposed equidistantly from and on opposing sides of a second center line of said address section, the second center line extending along the information reading direction...(Emphasis added).

With regard to claim 1, Takemura et al. does not disclose or suggest a second center line of an address section disposed equidistantly from and on opposing sides of respective center axis of both the first and second address pit sequences.

Takemura et al. discloses one center line (corresponding first center line (1c) of claim 1) of a grove 21 as recording track and another center line (corresponding second center line (3c) of claim 1) positioned between first address blocks 16 and 17 and second address blocks 18 and 19. These center lines **coincide** in a radial direction, thereby **giving no offset**. (Fig. 3A). This configuration corresponds with Fig. 11 of the present application, which is disclosed by Applicants as prior art.

In contrast, according to the exemplary embodiment of Applicant's invention, "the second center line (3c) is disposed parallel to and equidistantly from both of the center line (3ac) of the first address pit sequence 3a and the center line (3bc) of the second address pit sequence 3b." Thus, the offset occurs between **the center line of recording track and the center line positioned between address pit sequences**. The offset does not occur between the center line of land and the center line of groove as shown in Takemura.

Thus, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assertions in the "Response to Remarks" because the relationship of Takemura's first center line 22 and center line 22 disclosed in Fig. 3A cannot be the correspondence to that of the first center line and the second center line of claim 1. In claim 1, the first center line and the second center line belong to the same recording track, while the first center line 22 and the second center line 28 belong to the adjacent tracks, respectively. That is, there exists no offset between center lines in the **one** recording track in Takemura's disclosure.

Because Takemura et al. does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 1, claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-3 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claim 3 includes a patentable distinction beyond that of claim 1. With regard to claim 3, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assertions at page 5, paragraph (c) of the Office Action because the center line of the recording track and the center line of the address blocks shown at Fig. 4A of Takemura et al. have **no shift**. The Examiner asserts that the center line corresponding to that of claim 3 is just a **virtual** line to show the case that the light spot is shifted. In Fig. 4A of Takemura et al., the center line of the guide groove and the center of address sections (16, 17) and (18, 19) are on the one same straight line. Therefore, Fig. 4A of Takemura does not disclose the features of claim 3 that the amount of shift occurs between the center line of recording track and the center line of address blocks. Furthermore, the direction of shift in Fig. 4A is disclosed because of its symmetrical arrangement.

Claim 21, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claim 21 is also allowable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Takemura et al. and Ton That. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection.

With regard to claim 4, Takemura et al. and Ton-That do not disclose or suggest,

> ...wherein the amount of shift of the center of said address section decreases continuously or in a **steplike manner** within said each zone...(Emphasis added).

Takemura et al. is described above.

Ton-That describes the amount of shift by 4-track units, and does not disclose the amount of shift with respect to zone. Further, Ton-That controls the amount of shift through a "burst" which is isolated symbol on disc. This "burst" is not an address. Claim 4 recites that the amount of shift is given as a "steplike manner" in the same zone.

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Takemura et al. and Miyagawa et al. As described above, Takemura et al. does not disclose the features of claim 1. Miyagawa et al. teaches an optical information recording medium that includes at least one groove track and at least one land track allowing information to be recorded on or reproduced from the groove track and the land track. Miyagawa et al. does not provide the features of claim 1 that are missing from Takemura et al. Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1. Thus, claims 6 and 7 are also allowable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Claims 8-9 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Takemura et al., Tanoue et al. and Inuoe et al. As described above, Takemura et al. does not disclose the features of claim 1.

Tanoue et al. teaches a first-half header portion constituted by a first header portion whose VFO portion as long repeated data is arranged at the start and a second header portion whose VFO portion as short repeated data is arranged at the start is used as the header portion of each of land sectors arranged in a predetermined number along a spiral track. Tanoue et al. does not provide the features of claim 1 that are missing from Takemura et al.

Inuoe teaches an optical disk that has address recording sections each of which has a wobbled part of one of side walls of a groove. Each address recording section is formed by providing convexes of a groove in an adjacent land so as to widen the groove. Inoue et al. does not provide the features of claim 1 that are missing from Takemura et al.

Claims 8, 9 and 14 depend from claim 1. Thus, claims 8,9 and 14 are also allowable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1.

The Examiner indicated in the Office Action that claims 19, 22 and 23 would be allowable if amended to be independent and to include all of the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. Because, as described above, claims 1 and 21 are in condition for allowance, no amendment to claims 19, 22 and 23 is needed.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicants

LEA/DFD/fp/dmw

Dated: February 26, 2007

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on February 26, 2007.

Donna M. Wellings

89842